

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,532	(	02/25/2004	James Charles Bohling	A01496A	2731
21898	7590	05/15/2006		EXAM	INER
ROHM AN	D HAAS	COMPANY	HEARD, THOMAS SWEENEY		
PATENT DE		<del></del>	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		E MALL WEST		AKTONII	TATERNOMBER
PHILADELF	HIA, PA	. 19106-2399		1654	

DATE MAILED: 05/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/786,532	BOHLING ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Thomas S. Heard	1654				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN 1.136(a). In no event, however, may iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) Mo tute, cause the application to become	IICATION. a reply be timely filed  ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _	·					
<b>2</b> 4/	his action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C	.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-55 is/are pending in the applicat						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	drawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) <u>1-55</u> are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Exan						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)						
Applicant may not request that any objection to						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e Examiner. Note the attacl	ned Office Action of form P1O-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	eign priority under 35 U.S.C	c. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority docum		Application No.				
<ul><li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li><li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage</li></ul>						
		en received in this National Stage				
application from the International Bu  * See the attached detailed Office action for a		not received				
- See the attached detailed Office action for a	not of the defined doples i	(a) ( 1000) ( a)				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	· —	ew Summary (PTO-413) No(s)/Mail Date				
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948     Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/Statement Notes)    Paper Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	,	of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 1654

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 14, 38, and 46 are drawn to a T-20 and T-1249 peptide, classified in class 514, subclass 2, for example.
- II. Claims 1-13, 15-37, and 51 are drawn to a method of making the composition of Group I using chlorotrityl chloride linkers in resin beads, classified in class 530, subclass 333, for example.
- III. Claims 39-45 and 52 are drawn to a method of making polypeptide compositions using nickel alloy filters, classified in class 530, subclass 333, for example.
- IV. Claims 47-50 are drawn to a method of making polypeptides using a plurality of functionalized resin beads made from copolymer comprising less than 5% organic extractables, classified in class 530, subclass 333, for example.
- V. Claim 53 is drawn to an improved method of making polypeptide compositions optionally using linkers covalently bound to resin beads, classified in class 530, subclass 333, for example.
- VI. Claims 54-55 are drawn to a process of making a T-20 or T-1249 compositions, or fragments thereof using functionalized resin beads, classified in class 530, subclass 333, for example.

Art Unit: 1654

The inventions are distinct, each from the other for the following reasons:

Inventions I and (II-VI) are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case standard solid-state of solution peptide chemistries can be used to make the peptides instantly claimed.

The methods of Inventions II-VI, as evidenced by the claims themselves, are directed to different inventions which are not connected in design, operation, or effect. These methods are independent since they are not disclosed as capable of use together, they have different modes of operation, they have different functions, and they have different effects, and different steps. One would not have to practice the various methods at the same time to practice just one method alone.

The inventions above are patentably distinct. The search for each of the above inventions is not co-extensive particularly with regard to the literature search. Burden consists not only of specific searching of classes and subclasses, but also of searching multiple databases for foreign references and literature searches. Burden also resides in the examination of independent claim sets for clarity, enablement, and double patenting issues. Further, a reference that would anticipate the invention of one group

Art Unit: 1654

would not necessarily anticipate or even make obvious another group. Finally, the consideration for patentability is different in each case. Thus, it would be an undue burden to examine all of the above inventions in one application and the restriction for examination purposes as indicated above is deemed proper.

Regardless of which group is elected, a further election of species is required.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: METHOD OF MANUFACTURING POLYPEPTIDES, INCLUDING T-20 AND T-1249, AT COMMERCIAL SCALE, AND POLYPEPTIDE COMPOSITIONS RELATED THERETO

No matter which group is chosen, Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species (T-20 or T-1249) with all variables defined (resins, initiators, resin beads, filters, etc...) for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, the majority of the claims are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include

Art Unit: 1654

all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the

Art Unit: 1654

requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas S Heard whose telephone number is (571) 272-2064. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bruce Campell can be reached on (571) 272-0974. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Page 7

Application/Control Number: 10/786,532

Art Unit: 1654

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**TSH** 

Cecilia J. Tsang U
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1600